

# **S P E E C H**

—OF—

**R. J. CARTWRIGHT, Esq.,**

MADE BEFORE THE

**Vestry of St. George's Church,**

**KINGSTON,**

**On Monday, the 1st of December, 1862,**

IN SUPPORT OF A RESOLUTION, MOVED BY

**Dr. Robison.**

---

**KINGSTON:**

**JAMES M. CREIGHTON, PRINTER.**

**1862.**

SECRET

# SPEECH

—OF—

**R. J. CARTWRIGHT, Esq.,**

MADE BEFORE THE

**Vestry of St. George's Church,**

**KINGSTON,**

**On Monday, the 1st of December, 1862,**

IN SUPPORT OF A RESOLUTION, MOVED BY

**Dr. Robison.**



KINGSTON:  
JAMES M. CREIGHTON, PRINTER.

1862.

L

F1028 1862 C3 cop 2

11.5.49

Dr. Lorne Pierce

6/1

p 2  
11.5.49

Dr. Lorne Pierce

## PREFACE.

---

In consequence of the numerous mistatements which have been made relative to the conduct and motives of myself, and Messrs. Ross and Robison, I have found myself compelled to publish my speech before the vestry of St. George's Church.

There is much therein which we were reluctant to discuss, but I must observe that (with the exception of one statement, viz:— Mr. Simpson's correction relative to time of His Lordship's pledge given at Ottawa), Dr. Lewis' own friends admitted the correctness of the facts stated, giving of course, their own explanation thereof. Under these circumstances the public will expect to hear His Lordship's own statement of these matters. When that is given by himself, or if by another, with his declared and express approval, they will be in a position to judge between us.

R. J. CARTWRIGHT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
PRESS



## SPEECH OF R. J. CARTWRIGHT, ESQ.,

MADE BEFORE THE VESTRY OF ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH, ON MONDAY,  
THE 1ST DEC., 1862, IN SUPPORT OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION,  
MOVED BY DR. T. W. ROBISON.

### RESOLUTION.

"That the congregation of St. George's Church, has learned with great regret, that the Lord Bishop of Ontario has appointed the Ven. Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, without reference to, and in disregard of the well known wishes of the congregation; and from the many painful rumors which have connected Dr. Lauder's name with the election of the Lord Bishop and with this Rectory, that, without asserting or insinuating that the rumors had foundation in fact it is in the opinion of this congregation highly detrimental to the best interests of the congregation, and of the Church, that the appointment should have been made, or having been made, that it should be maintained."

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN :—

Before I proceed to discuss the resolution which I have the honor to support, I wish to say that the reason why the vestry meeting was summoned for so late a day as Friday last, was specially to give you an opportunity for recovering from your first natural outburst of indignation, and in order that you might vote calmly and conscientiously as the facts and your conscience directed you. This, I know, is the earnest wish of my esteemed friends, Mr. Ross and Dr. Robison, as well as my own, and, I may also add, that in my judgment you would not be justified in passing this resolution without some other and further grounds than those which I think fully warranted your conduct in passing it at the indignation meeting of Wednesday, the 19th. ult.

And, Gentlemen, I fear I must yet further tax your patience while I recapitulate the leading facts of the case. You all know that His Lordship is a very young Bishop,—that he is of no very long standing as a clergyman even,—you know also that he was elected by a very small clerical majority after an unusually long and protracted canvass up to the last moment of which every single clerical vote was of great importance to him. You know, too, that he was mainly elected by lay influence, and that that influence was especially exerted on his behalf, because it was supposed that he was a much better Protestant than his opponent, Dr. Bethune. And I do say, that under these circumstances, Dr. Lewis was bound to pay all reasonable deference to the wishes of the laity, and not to be in too great a hurry to kick down the ladder by which he has mounted to his present elevation. You are aware, also, that Dr. Lewis, at the Synod lately held at Ottawa, succeeded, after a pretty warm contest with the laity, and after what I consider a very peculiar use of his power of veto, in obtaining the right of presentation to all the rectories in this diocese, on the honorable understanding, however, that he would not use that power to make any appointment distasteful to the wishes of a congregation. And it is to be noted that Dr. Lewis was bound to be specially careful whom he appointed to the Rectory of Kingston, if for no other reason than for this, that I am informed every parish in and about Kingston voted dead against him on this question, thereby conveying a tolerably distinct caution that he ought to be careful how he exercised his patronage here. Now, what does Dr. Lewis do after having obtained the right of presentation under these very peculiar circumstances? Why, the very moment he gets it into his hands he goes and appoints a clergyman to this Rectory, whom he must have known to be distasteful to the great majority of the congregation,—a clergyman whose name has been long associated with his own and with this Rectory by a peculiarly scandalous rumour; and he does all this so quietly and expeditiously that not one soul in Kingston, so far as I am aware, heard that the appointment was likely to be made, till the man was actually appointed, and within a few hours of his induction!!!

Then, when the uproar, which was the natural and inevitable result of these proceedings took place, Dr. Lewis turns round on us with a charming air of injured innocence, and tells us that if



we had waited on him meekly, cap in hand, with bated breath and whispered humbleness, he might graciously have condescended to take our case into consideration, and perhaps have advised Dr. Lauder to resign!

Well, Gentlemen, so we would, so we would, if Dr. Lewis would have given us a chance, but we hadn't even an hour; and, I am bound to say, that if we had, the tone and manner his Lordship saw fit to use to the last deputation from the congregation, which waited on him on a similar subject, was not such as to tempt any honourable man to address him again. And I must say further that I am informed by some members of that deputation that their recollection of what then occurred does not correspond with his Lordship's statement made here on Monday last. This, at least, I must add, that his Lordship ought to have been the very last man in this city to have said one word about any lack of courtesy or of straightforwardness on our part. If there was any lack of courtesy or of straightforwardness, it was *not* on the part of the congregation of St. George.

Finally, Gentlemen, before I quit this part of my subject, I have one question to ask Dr. Lewis. Why did he appoint Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston? He gave you the answer himself in his speech in this very place on Monday. He told you that he knew that Dr. Lauder was not a burning or a shining light, (I use his own words), but that he appointed him because he was a very convenient and useful man to him, (Dr. Lewis); in plain English, because Dr. Lauder was his convenient creature and complete tool. Now, I can understand this being a reason under other and widely-different circumstances for Dr. Lewis' own self; but I do emphatically declare, that it was no kind of reason why the congregation of St. George should be forced to accept a man they detest, because it suited Dr. Lewis' convenience; nor do I consider it to be at all a sufficient and honourable ground for Dr. Lewis' promoting Dr. Lauder to be the second man in his diocese, that he thought he would prove a convenient tool.

And now, Gentlemen, with respect to the resolution itself, I may observe that it contains three distinct assertions, or implications, call them which you will. First, it states that Dr. Lewis appointed Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, well knowing that such appointment would be distasteful to the congregation. Secondly, that a certain wide-spread public rumour coupling his

name and Dr. Lauder's with the election to the Bishopric, and with this Rectory, did exist. Thirdly, that under these circumstances Dr. Lauder's appointment was, and is, highly detrimental to the best interests of the Church and of this congregation.

Now, Gentlemen, you will please observe that proof of these three assertions is all that you require to justify you in passing this resolution; and proof of these is all that Mr. Ross or I have ever pledged ourselves to give. Mind, I do not say that I have nothing more to urge on other matters; but I do say that we only stand pledged to give proof of these three things, and that proof I shall now proceed to lay before you. And with reference to the statement, that Dr. Lewis appointed Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, well knowing that such appointment would be distasteful to the congregation, I shall have once more to beg your patience while I recall to your recollection the fact that some months ago, at the time of the departure of the Rev. Alexander Stewart, it was currently reported, chiefly, I believe, from some expressions dropped by the Bishop himself, that Dr. Lauder was to come here as Assistant Minister; and you will also remember that there was then a pretty general and audible outburst of discontent. Well, from whatever cause, Dr. Lauder did not come here, but was sent to Brockville, and we fondly imagined we had done with him for ever. Now, I do not say positively that our discontent was the reason, although I can myself answer for its being tolerably loud spoken, and although it would be a very fair inference that his Lordship, who was living in Kingston at the time, and in constant communication with many members of the congregation, must have known of this discontent; but this I do say, that if his Lordship did not hear of it, then I am certain he was the only man at all closely connected with this congregation who did not. Nevertheless, I will not rest my case on proofs like these. And first, I beg to inform you that his Lordship himself, within these few days, stated to Dr. Robison, in presence of the Rev. Mr. Denroche, that he would not have appointed Dr. Lauder if he had known he was distasteful to the congregation, but that with the exception of Mr. Simpfoul, no man had ever told him so. And I call on Dr. Robison to rise and correct me if I have made any misstatement. (Here Dr. Robison rose and confirmed Mr. C.'s statement.) And, secondly, I beg to say that Mr. S. Taylor, who is also present, informed me in presence of Mr. Ross and Dr. Robison, that he,

several months since, deliberately went out to Alwington for the express purpose of warning his Lordship that the appointment of Dr. Lauder, in any shape, would be most distasteful to the congregation. And I call on Mr. Samuel Taylor to rise and correct me if I have made any misstatement. (Here Mr. Samuel Taylor rose and confirmed Mr C.'s statement.)

And with respect to his Lordship's pledge given publicly in his Synod at Ottawa to the effect that he would not use his power to appoint any one distasteful to a congregation, I beg to say that there is some difference as to the exact words used by his Lordship. I was informed by Sheriff Corbett, in presence of Dr. Robison, that his Lordship said that he would not appoint any one distasteful. Mr. J. Shannon, who was also present, thought the words were, that he would not appoint any one whom he knew to be distasteful. Mr. A. O'Loughlin, I am informed, stated that his Lordship said that it would be very extraordinary if he appointed any one who would be distasteful. Other gentlemen confirm the statement of Sheriff Corbett. But, at all events, all these witnesses are agreed in two main points, that his Lordship pledged himself in substance not to make any appointment distasteful to a congregation, and that he gave this pledge before he got the power into his hands at all. (Here an interruption, Mr. Simpson stating that the pledge was made after.) Mr. C. resumed. This may be; I only repeat these gentlemen's statements, not having been personally present, but from the different wording of their statements it occurs to me that the pledge may have been repeated more than once, before as well as after. And now, my friends, I have to ask you one question. Setting aside for the moment any evidence we have that his Lordship knew that Dr. Lauder's appointment would be distasteful to the congregation of St. George, I ask you what would you consider to be the honourable fulfilment of an honourable pledge, given on an occasion like this? Do you consider that his Lordship has a right to demand that he should be deemed to have fulfilled his pledge in every case where the congregation fail to furnish legal proof that he knew the appointment would be distasteful? Or do you think that he was bound in all honour to take all reasonable and ordinary precautions to ascertain that the man of his choice would not be distasteful? Now, so far as I am aware, neither his Lordship nor his Lordship's friends have ever dared to assert that he took the smallest or slightest pains to

ascertain whether Dr. Lauder's appointment would be popular or not—that he so much as mentioned his intention to a single member of this congregation. Now, do you call this the honourable fulfilment of an honourable pledge? I certainly do not; and I can liken his Lordship's conduct in this matter to nothing but the conduct of a merchant, who, when he suspects his affairs are embarrassed, deliberately abstains from taking stock, or balancing his books, or taking any other ordinary or reasonable precautions for ascertaining his true position, in order that when he finally appears before the Bankruptcy commissioners he may be able to swear with a clear conscience that he really did not know that he was insolvent. And in this connection, I must observe, that not a few gentlemen here present who had occasion to notice his Lordship's manner on the Monday and Tuesday preceding our Indignation Meeting, told me then and since that he certainly did not look like a man conscious of having done nothing to mar his welcome back by his people, but rather like one who knew he had done a very disagreeable thing, and who was literally shaking with apprehension at the probable results. And as the question of the accuracy of his Lordship's recollections has come up, I must say plainly that several persons who heard his Lordship's written statement made here on Monday last, wherein he stated not a few things on his own sole authority, have informed me that their impressions differed widely from his on more matters than the account of the reception of the deputation before adverted to, and I may also be permitted to instance the well known fact of his present controversy with the Venerable Archdeacon Brough, whom his Lordship, in his recent well known letter to the Bishop of Huron. (Here the speaker was interrupted and called to order, and this subject dropped.)

And now, Gentlemen, I come to the most painful portion of to-day's explanations; and I must be permitted to say, in justice to myself and to my two friends, Dr. Robison and Mr. Ross, that it is with the utmost possible reluctance that we find ourselves compelled to introduce the subject. In fact, we have been fairly dragged into it, but as the Bishop, or Dr. Lauder, or the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, have spoken of the matter to several here present, we must now go through with it.

You all doubtless remember how some twelve months back the late Dean of Ontario saw fit to dismiss the Rev. Alexander Stewart in a very abrupt and summary manner. In fact, I

think, he sent him a letter on a Friday to say that all connection between them must cease on the Sunday following. You also recollect that the congregation indignantly took the matter up and held a special vestry meeting upon it, the result of which was that the old Dean withdrew his summary dismissal, and gave Mr. Stewart fair and honourable notice. Now it so happened that a day or two before your vestry meeting the Dean came to me and insisted on my reading the correspondence between him and Mr. S. I saw at a glance that one of the letters, at least, was not composed by himself, and besides remonstrating with him pretty vigorously, both verbally and by letter, I sent a letter to that vestry, (of which I still possess a copy), and in which I stated broadly that I felt sure the old Dean had not acted in that unhandsome way of his own mere motive. Still I did not know to whom to attribute the production, nor was, it till some months after that I, Mr. Ross, Dr. Robison, and another gentleman, not here present, received, to our surprise and sorrow, absolute ocular proof that the letter to which I alluded was the handiwork of the Lord Bishop of Ontario!

Gentlemen, all this was very bad, particularly as the Rev. A. Stewart was notoriously a most determined opponent of the Bishop; it was very bad, I say, that his Lordship should have been concerned in this matter at all, in any shape or way—it was ten times worse, in my opinion, to leave my poor old friend, the Dean, to bear the obloquy of the transaction; but it was worst and basest and meanest of all afterwards to deny all participation in the transaction, when taxed therewith by the Venerable Archdeacon Patton.

Gentlemen, I have proofs of what I state. Dr. Patton, in the first place, himself informed Mr. Ross and another gentleman, (whose name I at present refrain from mentioning,) on the authority of the Bishop, that he, i.e., the Bishop, had nothing to do with Mr. Stewart's dismissal; and my friends, I now hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Dr. Patton, in which he deliberately repeats the assertion. This letter I will now read. (Reads the letter.) You will note that Dr. Patton only says, "that he is assured the Bishop had nothing to do with it; he does not say by whom assured; and, so to make assurance doubly sure, Dr. Patton was expressly asked that question, to which he replies, that he was so assured by Dr. Lewis himself. (A copy of this letter also is produced.) Now, my friends, you must



draw your own conclusions from these facts. In justice to Mr. Ross, Dr. Robison and myself, I must state that the moment we saw whereto these things would grow, and so long ago as Saturday week, we deliberately sent for the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, and laid before him so much of these facts as we had then legal proof of, intimating, besides, our own moral certainty as to the others; and we begged him then and there, as the Bishop's friend and adviser, to use all his influence to induce the Bishop to withdraw from this contest about the Rectory, and to spare us the shame and disgrace of making this public exposure. And I must also observe that although that reverend gentleman had our full permission to repeat our statements to the Bishop and to Dr. Lauder, he has no sort of right to speak of them as charges formally preferred, and must himself bear the responsibility of having spoken so publicly on the matter as to compel us to make these statements. I desire further to say that I by no means admit the accuracy of his written memoranda, which he took down for his own convenience, and which was neither read over nor approved by us.

If Mr. Bartlett's so called charges are anything at all they are charges preferred by himself, to which he is welcome to call us as witnesses; and I may add, per parenthesis, that it is the height of absurdity on his part to expect Messrs. Ross, Robison, or myself to prefer charges against Dr. Lauder before the Bishop while the imputations against the Bishop himself, are, in my humble judgement, ten times heavier. And with that one remark, gentlemen, I shall pass on to the second assertion contained in my resolution, viz.,—That this public scandal touching Dr. Lauder being intended to receive the Rectory of Kingston for his services to Dr. Lewis, did exist and was of long standing and wide spread. Now, on all these points, I can give you my own testimony and that of Messrs. Ross and Robison, and I believe of Dr. Yates, Mr. Askew, and many others here present, to the effect that we had heard it many times, and from many different persons; and I also happen to have in my hand a copy of the *Watchman*, published at Toronto, in which the editor avers that to his own personal knowledge and that of others in Toronto, the report to which I have alluded was currently circulated, even there, long before Dr. Lewis' election. And I must say if, under these circumstances—and I can easily supplement them with a hundred more—I was not war-



ranted in speaking of this rumor as a public scandal in my speech of the 19th ult., then there is no such thing as a public scandal in *rerum naturâ*. As to the other point which some persons may say is implied here, namely, that Dr. Lauder's conduct during the canvass was so objectionable as to furnish some grounds, at least, for the general currency of the report adverted to, I have to say that the same persons who were aware of the rumour were aware also of the fact that he worked most indefatigably and zealously to secure Dr. Lewis' election; but, I must add, that though his friends admit this, they contend that he only did what he had a perfect right to do, and that he did not outstep the limits of strict clerical partisanship.

Gentlemen, I hope my reverend friends here present will not be offended if I say that I do not know what these limits may be, but that I am informed by Dr. Robison that he distinctly recollects Dr. Lauder's having on one occasion, at a meeting held in this vestry room, pledged himself not to canvass any more,—that pledge being drawn from him, as I understood, by some remarks which his special zealousness had produced. And I am also informed by the same gentleman, that the Rev. Mr. Bower of this neighbourhood, stated to him more than once, that Dr. Lauder had subsequently canvassed him. Furthermore, gentlemen—and I make this statement not so far as I know as affecting Dr. Lauder, but simply to show you that the scandalous disregard of truth and honour on the part of some of our clergy, has reached a pitch, which, unless instantly and sternly checked, must make our church a very scorn and derision among all honourable men, furthermore, I say, I have here a letter recently received from Judge Malloch of Perth, which I will here read. (Reads letter.) Sharp practice this, gentlemen, very sharp practice; and although I do not as yet know what ornament of our church has been improving her reputation after this fashion, I take leave to say that it imperatively behoves you and all really sincere members of the Church of England to stop such acts at any cost. I should explain that the church notes here referred to were given, I believe, for the Ontario Episcopal Endowment Fund. And with this I quit the second portion of my resolution. As regards the third statement, that this appointment has been, and is highly detrimental to the best interests of the church and of the congregation, I think there can hardly be two opinions. Or must I recall to your minds the universal and all but unprecedented outburst of indig-

nation with which the news was received, the unanimous condemnation accorded to it by the provincial press, with scarcely one solitary exception, or the lamentable consequences which have followed, and I fear will continue to follow it?

Gentlemen, I do not believe a man could be found in the whole diocese to stand up and say that this appointment was not detrimental. For the rest, I beg you to observe that I have strictly followed the injunction with respect to the Bishop, that everything should be substantiated out of the mouth of two or three witnesses. On my sole authority I have said nothing. It is due to myself to say that I believe every word I have said to be true, but that if I can be proved to have wronged him, I am prepared to bear any punishment which can be inflicted, first, and to make the humblest apologies thereafter. And, now, gentlemen, once more and for the last time I ask, do or do you not, on your honour and consciences, believe that this appointment was and is highly detrimental to the best interests of our church and our congregation?

COPIES OF TWO LETTERS FROM VEN. DR. PATTON  
TO C. S. ROSS, ESQ.

CORNWALL, Nov. 26th, 1862.

MY DEAR MR. ROSS,—

As nearly as I can remember the conversation alluded to in your note of yesterday it was to this effect: You mentioned to me that the summary dismissal of the Rev. Mr. Stewart was creating a prejudice against the Bishop elect, inasmuch as the act was generally attributed to his influence with the Archdeacon. I at once replied that such imputations against Dr. Lewis were very unfair, for that I was assured he had nothing to do with it, but that the act arose from personal feelings on the part of the Archdeacon towards Mr. S. This, I think, you will agree with me in regarding as the substance of what passed between us on the occasion alluded to.

\* \* \* \* \*

With the kindest regards to Mrs. Ross and family,

I remain, my dear sir,

Yours very faithfully,

HY. PATTON.

C. S. ROSS, ESQ.,  
Kingston.

[COPY.]

CORNWALL, Nov. 28th, 1862.

MY DEAR MR. ROSS,—

It was certainly from the Bishop elect, himself, that I received the assurance that he was not the author of Mr. Stewart's summary dismissal. Whether I used the name of Dr. Lewis in my conversation with you or not, I cannot distinctly recollect; but at all events I stated my assurance so positively, as must have left upon your mind the impression that I had derived my

authority immediately from the Bishop Elect; and as both yourself and Mr. Rogers state that I gave the Bishop Elect as my authority, I have no doubt that I did so. My desire, as I am sure you can both bear witness, was to defend his Lordship from the injurious impressions which many entertained, that he was the cause of the hasty dismissal of Mr. Stewart.

Hoping the above may prove entirely satisfactory,

I remain, yours very truly,

HY. PATTON.

C. S. Ross, Esq.,  
Kingston.

---

FROM JUDGE MALLOCH TO C. S. ROSS.

[COPY.]

PERTH, Nov. 28th, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR,—

With regard to the Church notes, various defences have been set up. I have had the most trouble at the village of Renfrew, where several gentlemen swore that the notes were given on the express conditions that the Bishop would reside at Ottawa, and that a resident clergyman would be settled at Renfrew within three months. Neither of these conditions were complied with. But as they were not embodied in the notes, and the notes were transferred to the plaintiff for value, before they became due, and without notice, the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The impression is that the notes were transferred to O'Donnell, merely to prevent the parties setting up this defence, and consequently, a very strong feeling exists with regard to some of these suits; and I have no doubt it will be at considerable sacrifice in such a season as this that some of the parties will be able to satisfy the judgments obtained against them.

I am, my dear sir,

Yours respectfully,

J. G. MALLOCH.

C. S. Ross, Esq.,  
Kingston.

our-  
my  
am  
rom  
was

N.

2.

been  
rew,  
the  
and  
thin  
with.  
were  
and  
im-  
rely  
ntly,  
uits;  
ch a  
the

I.